RECEIVED CENTRAL FAX CENTER AUG 1 1 2010

RESPONSE UNDER 37 CFR 1.116 EXPEDITED PROCEDURE EXAMINING GROUP: 1713

Patent

32692 Customer Number Case No.: 59031US003

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

First Named Inventor:

YAPEL, ROBERT A

Application No.:

10/595152

Confirmation No.:

3408

Filed:

17-SEP-2004

Title:

DIE COATERS

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION

Mail Stop AF Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION [37 CFR § 1.8(a)]
CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION [57 CPR 9 1.5(8)]
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being:
☐ transmitted to United States Patent and Trademark Office on the date shown below via the Office electronic filing system.
deposited with the United States Postal Service on the date shown below with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.
Itransmitted by facsimile on the date shown below to the United States Patent and Trademark Office at 571-273-8300.
August 11, 2010
Date Signed by: Sherri K.W. Johnson

Dear Sir:

This is to request reconsideration of applicant's response to final rejection filed July 24, 2010 in light of the Advisory Action dated August 6, 2010 and a telephone conversation between the undersigned attorney and Examiner Albert Hilton on August 10, 2010. Although the Advisory Action states that applicant's amendments were not entered, because they raise new issues that would required further consideration and/or search, in the telephone conversation, it was pointed out that the Final Office Action dated May 27, 2010 had indicated that claims 24, 26-28 and 31 were allowed, claims 12-14 were objected to as dependent upon a rejected base claim, and claims 10, 11, 15 and 16 were rejected. It was also pointed out that, in applicant's response to final rejection (Amendment and Response Under 37 CFR §1.116) claim 12 had been amended to incorporate the limitations formerly in claim 10 (from which claim 12 had depended) avoiding the objection to claims 12-14. Since this application has been transferred from Examiner Brenda Lamb (who signed the Final Office Action) to Examiner Hilton, Examiner Hilton was asked to review the record.